

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed February 9, 2007, claims 4 and 7-18 were "objected to"; claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasuo (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,909); claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bortolotto (EP-700209 – Derwent 1996-131131); claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Official Notice by the Examiner. The foregoing rejections, objections and Official Notice are respectfully traversed.

Minor amendments have been made to claim 1. "Objected to" claim 4 has been rewritten into independent form to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, dependent claims 7-18 which depend from claim 4 should now be in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-18 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Neither of the foregoing references, individually or combined, discuss or suggest **"a projection television comprising: a screen displaying a picture; a body casing forming an outer appearance of the projection television and combining with the screen; a supporting unit provided on an inside of the body casing and positioned beneath the screen to support a bottom of the screen; and a drain hole formed at a bottom of the supporting unit and positioned directly underneath the screen to discharge moisture permeated into the screen,"** as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

Neither Yasuo nor Bortolotto discuss or even teach **"a projection television"** as recited in claim 1 (see also paragraphs [0003]-[0005] and [0013] of the specification of the present invention, for example. That is, these references are not related to a projection television.

Instead, Yasuo merely discusses a television receiver installed in a high-humidity environment, for example, a bathroom. The television receiver 3 and a dehumidifier 5 are installed in a container case 2 provided with a waterproof structure, a drainage pipe 4 is connected to the dehumidifier to discharge water generated in a dehumidification operation to the outside of the container case (see Abstract and FIGS. 1-3, for example). In addition to not being related to a projection television, Yasuo also fails to discuss **"a supporting unit provided on an inside of the body casing and positioned beneath the screen to support a bottom of the**

screen; and a drain hole formed at a bottom of the supporting unit and positioned directly underneath the screen to discharge moisture permeated into the screen,” as recited in amended claim 1. That is, as shown in FIG. 3, for example, Yasuo is silent regarding any type of supporting element inside of the container case 2 to support a bottom of the screen of the receiving tube 6, or a “drain hole directly underneath the screen” as recited in claim 1.

Further, as previously mentioned, Bortolotto also fails to discuss “a projection television” as recited in claim 1. Instead, Bortolotto merely discusses a television cabinet integrated with a piece of modular furniture (see Abstract). The cabinet includes a box-like flush-mount structure 12, which is a frame for a cathode-ray tube 19, electronic equipment 20 and control devices. One or more front regions and/or top or bottom regions of the box like structure 12 includes holes or grilles (17, 18, 25 and 26) to connect the inside of the structure 12 to the outside. As discussed at column 5, lines 33-35, **the grilles are provided merely to allow airflow to dissipate the heat produced by the electronic equipment 20.** Thus, Bortolotto also fails to discuss “a supporting unit provided on an inside of the body casing and positioned beneath the screen to support a bottom of the screen; and a drain hole formed at a bottom of the supporting unit and positioned directly underneath the screen to discharge moisture permeated into the screen,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Regarding the 103 rejection and the Official Notice:

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the AAPA fails to discuss “a drain hole” as recited in claim 1, for example. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known in the art to have a drain hole at the bottom or at multiple positions based upon Yasuo and Bortolotto. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner based upon the reasons mentioned above.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the like Yasuo and Bortolotto, AAPA fails to recite **“a supporting unit provided on an inside of the body casing and positioned beneath the screen to support a bottom of the screen; and a drain hole formed at a bottom of the supporting unit and positioned directly underneath the screen to discharge moisture permeated into the screen,”** as recited in claim 1, for example. Instead, AAPA merely discusses the use of masking tape 170 at the bottom of the lenticular lens sheet and the fresnel lens sheet as shown in FIG. 6 of the AAPA.

Therefore, as previously mentioned, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Official Notice and request that the Examiner withdraw the Official Notice or provide additional references to support this assertion.

Accordingly, the AAPA fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the present invention. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or discuss all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/24/2007

By: 
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501